

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 21 1998

TENTH CIRCUIT

PATRICK FISHER
Clerk

ALBERT RAYMOND COPP, JR. and
MARJORIE LOUISE HAWORTH,

Plaintiff-Appellants,

v.

BOYD M. MCMASTER; SHARON L.
KINNISON; LORI L. LEWIS;
CAROL COLLINS; MONICA A.
SHARUM; KURT KELLY;
MARGARET E. KELLEY; FOURTH
JUDICIAL DISTRICT JUDGE-
SHERIDAN COUNTY, a/k/a John D.
Brackley,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 98-8020
(D.C. No. 97-CV-1060)
(Wyoming)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **SEYMOUR**, Chief Judge, **EBEL** and **BRISCOE**, Circuit Judges.

After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined
unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of

*This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the
doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, or collateral estoppel. The court
generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgments; nevertheless, an order
and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th Cir. R. 36.3.

this appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a); 10th Cir. R. 34.1.9. The cause is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

Plaintiffs Albert Raymond Copp, Jr. and Marjorie Louise Haworth appeal the district court's dismissal of their action against the several defendants for failure to state a claim. We affirm.

Although it is difficult to tell from the complaint, this action apparently arose out a state court action brought against plaintiffs by Lori L. Lewis, Ms. Haworth's daughter and a defendant in the present action, to collect a debt she claimed plaintiffs owed her. In addition to Ms. Lewis, plaintiffs sued the state court judge and two attorneys, one who represented them and another who was requested to do so. They also sued members of the Commission for Judicial Conduct and Ethics and the Assistant Bar Counsel for the Wyoming State Bar Board of Professional Responsibility because they were unhappy with the results of their complaints against the judge and one of the lawyers. Without specifying any facts to support their claims, plaintiffs asserted that the defendants had violated their "God given and Constitutional rights" under the 5th, 6th and 7th Amendments. See Complaint, rec., doc. 1.

In its order granting defendants' motions to dismiss, the district court carefully parsed plaintiffs' claims against the various defendants. We have reviewed the record and we are not persuaded the district court erred. We

therefore **AFFIRM** the district court's dismissal of all plaintiffs' claims substantially for the reasons given by the court in its Order on Motions to Dismiss dated February 27, 1998.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT

Stephanie K. Seymour
Chief Judge